

DISCOURSE,

— S H E W I N G —

That the EXPOSITIONS
which the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* have
given of the TEXTS alleged
against the Reverend DR. CLARKE
by a *Learned Layman*, are more
agreeable to the Interpretations of
Dr. Clarke, than to the Interpre-
tations of that *Learned Layman*.

By a *Clergyman in the Country*.

Magna est Veritas.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Ferd. Burleigh, in *Amiens*
Corner, 1714.

Price One Shilling.

DISCOURSE

OF THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

Rever

S

Y

your F

Happin

you, I

Behalf

one wh

Abilitie

Advers

TO THE

Reverend D^r CLARKE.

SIR,

YOU may admire perhaps, that one who, I think, never saw your Face, nor ever had the Happiness of conversing with you, should appear in your Behalf; and much more, that one who knows so well your Abilities to cope with your Adversaries from the Testi-

A 2 monies

The Preface.

monies of the Ancient Fathers, as well as from Scripture and from Reason, should come in to assist you in any kind. But I imagined that when your Adversaries were so many, and came so fast upon you, it might be no disagreeable Surprise to you, to find you were not wholly destitute of Friends; and that you had gained One Apologist, with respect particularly to the Fathers, who formerly was of another Mind. But I have Learned from St Cyprian, Epist. 73. Edit. Oxon. p. 208, [*Non quia semel erratum est, ideo sem-*

per

per
gis
men
&
&
pert
lucta
ving
Rea
tinu
it be
such
freely
when
them
sist
it.

Yon
Work

The Preface.

*per errandum esse ; cum magis Sapien-
tibus & Deum ti-
mentibus congruat, patefactæ
& perspectæ veritati libenter
& incunctanter obsequi, quam
pertinaciter atq; obstinate re-
luctari,]* That a Man's ha-
ving once erred, is not a
Reason why he should con-
tinue so to do ; for that
it becomes wise Men and
such as fear God, to yield
freely and readily to Truth,
whenever made known to
them ; rather than to per-
sist obstinately in rejecting
it.

*Your First Adversary, whose
Work is Published and Re-
commended*

The Preface.

commended by M^r Nelson, must be allowed to have had a competent Acquaintance with the Writings of the Ancient Fathers: And therefore I have considered him, in the following Discourse.

But your Second Adversary, whose Book is entitled, Remarks, &c. by the Author of Some Considerations, &c. seems to know very little of Antiquity. He makes only *νυκτομαχίαν*, a Skirmish in the Dark, and, *Ανδabatarum* more, fights with his Eyes shut; going wholly upon Hypotheses of his Own, without regarding the Tenour

The Preface.

nour either of Scripture or
Primitive Antiquity. And
therefore (I think) little needs
be said in Answer to Him.

I am, S I R,

Your assured Friend and

Humble Servant.

A

The Preface

more either of Scripture or
Positive Authority. And
therefore (I think) little needs
be said in Answer to Him.

I am, Sir,

Your assured Friend and

Humble Servant

A

DIS

That the
Ante-
of the
the R
Learne
agreea
of Dr
terpret
Layma

IT b
this
ling
out
perf
himself is
they give
the Antiqui
as deduced

DISCOURSE

SHEWING,

That the Expositions which the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers have given of the Texts alleged against the Reverend Dr *Clarke* by a *Learned Layman*, are more agreeable to the Interpretations of Dr *Clarke*, than to the Interpretations of that *Learned Layman*.

IT being the professed Design of this *Learned Gentleman*, in filling his Margin with Citations out of the *Ancient Fathers*, to persuade Others of what He himself is verily persuaded; viz. that they give great Light to, and confirm the Antiquity of the Doctrine He asserts, as deduced from Scripture: I shall endeavour

B

deavour

deavour to show that He hath failed in this Attempt; and that the Expositions which the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* give of the places which He hath been pleased to consider, are more favourable to Dr *Clarke's* Sentiments and Expositions, than they are to *His*. And this I shall do, by considering them rather in That order in which they lie in the New Testament, than in That order in which He hath been pleased to comment upon them.

I. I. And here I think it reasonable to observe in the *First* place, that it is not fair and ingenuous to cite the Fathers (by way of Authority) in confirmation of a *Doctrine* or Exposition of the Holy Scriptures, which They professedly and frequently oppose and disclaim: And yet this *Learned Gentleman* is frequently guilty of this fault. To give you a pregnant Instance of this kind. From these words of *Origen* in his Commentary on St *John*, I think the Son is the Splendor of the Whole Glory of God; he infers that the Son must contain All the perfections of the Father: And yet He could not but know, this was contrary to the plain words of *Ori-*

pag. 107.

gen in
tary.
Excellen
Thrones,
Powers,
not only
which is
he, He
and so e
Essence,
and Go
the livin
dom;)
compare
Image
on Matt
deu, ad
ness, no
his etern
αλλα τ
of the
And ag
this Re
mage of
For the
him, is
first Will
in him,
the tru

gen

gen in many places of that Commem-
 tary. Thus when He had exalted the
 Excellency of our Lord above all
 Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and
 Powers, and every Name that is named,
 not only in this World, but also in that
 which is to come; yet, saith

he, He who excells so many
 and so excellent Beings, in
 Essence, Dignity, Power,
 and Godhead, (as being
 the living Word and Wis-
 dom;) is in nothing of these to be

Ὁ πῶτον καὶ παλαι-
 των ὑπερέχων ἑσθ, καὶ
 προσέσθ, καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ
 θεότητι, ἢ συγκρίνεται
 κατ' οὐδὲν τῷ πατρί.
 Comm. in Joh. p. 218.

compared to the Father: For He is the
Image of his Goodness, (see Comm.
 on Matth. p. 377,) *Ἐ ἀπαύρασμα, ἢ*
θεῶ, ἀλλὰ τὸ δοξάζει αὐτὸν, and the Bright-
 ness, not of God, but of his Glory and
 his eternal Light; *Ἐ ἀτμίς, ἢ τῷ πατρὶ,*
ἀλλὰ τὸ δυνάμει αὐτὸν, and a Ray, not
 of the Father, but of his Power.

And again; Perhaps for
 this Reason He is the I-
 mage of the invisible God:
 For the Will which is in
 him, is the Image of the
 first Will; and the Godhead
 in him, is the Image of
 the true Godhead: And

Καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ δι-
 αμα, εἰκὼν τῷ πρώτῳ
 θελήματι. καὶ ἡ ἐν αὐ-
 τῷ θεότης, εἰκὼν τῆς ἀ-
 ληθινῆς θεότητος. εἰκὼν
 δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος ὡς
 τῷ πατρὶ, φησὶ ἡ
 λέγεις ἀγαθόν. Ibid. p.
 228.

being the Image of his Father's Good-
ness, he saith, Why callest thou me
Good. And, p. 70, He not only as-
serts that the Father and the Son are,
ὁ αὐτὸς, ὁ αὐτὸς ἀεικαί, two
Lights which are distinct in Essence, but,
whereas our Lord is styled by St John, φῶς

ἀληθινόν, the true Light,
he adds, in like manner as
God the Father of Truth,
is higher and greater than
Truth; and being the Fa-
ther of Wisdom, is grea-
ter and more excellent, as
Ibid. p.
70.

He is Wisdom, (to wit,
than the Son;) by so much he excels
him in being the true Light. And last-
ly, in the very page cited, and in the
next page following, he asserts the
very same thing, viz. That the Father
is greater, ἢ αὐτὸς θεωρεῖται ὡς ἡ δόξα
ἐκείνη; and that when the Father glo-
rified the Son, the Inferior was glori-
fied by the more excellent, &c. For, saith He, the Father that sent
me, is Greater than I.

The like fault He commits in citing
Eusebius, even That Eusebius who

hath
would
the Son
all. A
sebins
God of
God th
then T
is him
Wisdom
δύναμις
a second
things;
be subje
to be a
ther of
all creat
but then
wee, &
He is the
Abraham
but then
affirm this
of all th
to say th
and invar
of all, w
appeared
that, in th

hath told him, that *He* *John 5. 18* *ἐμὴν*
would not be Pious who said *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἰσ-*
the Son was The God *ὡς, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, Contr,*
over *Marcell. l. i. c. 7.*

all. And first, he cites *Eusebius* *lib. i.*
sebius saying, that *Christ* is Lord and *Hist. Ec-*
God of all created Beings, and the Lord *cles. l. 1.*
God that appeared to Abraham. But *c. 2.*
 then This God of all created Beings, *pag. 9.*
 is himself, *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,* the *Prov. 8, 22,*
Wisdom which God first Created, and according
devised *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,* *LXX.*
 a second Cause after the Father of all *pag. 5.*
 things; one who is said, *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,* to *pag. 6.*
 be subject to his Father's commands, yea *pag. 8.*
 to be a Substance ministering to the Fa-
 ther of all things in the Production of
 all created Beings. He is Lord also;
 but then he is, *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,*
ὡς ἑαυτοῦ, a second Lord after the Father.
 He is the Lord God, that appeared to
 Abraham in Human Shape;
 but then it is impious to *Τὸν ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἑαυτοῦ*
 affirm this of the First Cause *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,*
 of all things, and absurd *ὡς ἑαυτοῦ Θεόν, ὡς ἑαυτοῦ,* *p. 6.*
 to say that the unbegotten
 and invariable Essence of God the Creator
 of all, was transformed into (that is,
 appeared in) the Shape of a Man. So *52*
 that, in the Judgment of Eusebius, the
 God

God that appeared to *Abraham*, was neither the Supreme God, nor of the same individual Essence with him.

I am amazed at his second Citation from *Eusebius*, which he renders thus; And all this may be the reason why He (Christ) is also God, because He only is the Son of God by Nature, and called only-begotten: Demonstr. Evang. l. 5. c. 4. p. 227. For, the words immediately preceding are these; *ἐν καὶ φύσιν μονογενὴς υἱός*, though He be by Nature the only-begotten Son, and called God, *ἀλλ' ἔχει ὁ πατρὸς θεός*, yet is He not the Supreme God, but the first-begotten Son of God, and therefore God. And the words immediately following are these: And be-

*καὶ τὸ δὲ ὅλον εὐχέιν
τὴν μὲν Θεὸν τὴν ἑαυ-
τοῦ, ζῶντα, καὶ νοερόν τε
καὶ πνεῦμα τὸ παῖσι
παρμωσιωμένον. Ibid.*

cause He, being in all things made like to the Father, entirely preserves the living and intellectual Image of the Only God; and having the similitude of the Divinity itself impressed upon him, and the Virtues of the Essence of the unbegotten Father, who is without Beginning, conferred upon him according to the pattern of Similitude, i. e. so as to make him like to the Archetypal

Archetypal
vine
as
wit
it, a
not
the
the
μὲν, &
so th
ther
Natr
from
δαί,
secon
who
the
faith
ped a
Him
He,
wit,
the
thing
καὶ μὲν
ζῶντα
God,
One;
fied w

Archetypal exemplar ; therefore the Divine Scriptures do fitly call him God, as being—dignified by the Father with this Appellation ; as having received it, ἀλλ' ἐκ ιδιόκτητον αὐτῶν ἐχούμενα, but not having it as his own Propriety ; for the Father gives, and the Son receives it ; ὥστε κυρίως καὶ ἵνα ἐκείνον εἴ) Θεόν, & μόνον μὲν, & φησὶ ὄντα, καὶ μὴ παρ' ἑτέρου λαβόντα, so that properly speaking He [viz. the Father] is the One God, who alone is so by Nature, and receives not his Godhead from another ; Θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς διουσιεῖων ἡξιώσθαι, but the Son is only dignified in the second place, as being the Image of God ; who hath received his being God, from the Father. In the same Chapter He saith that Christ is only to be worshipped as God, by reason of

Him that is greater than He, dwelling in him ; to wit, the Supreme God, even the Father, and God of all

things : and that therefore ὁ μὲν ἀληθὴς πατὴρ. pag. 226.

καὶ μόνος Θεός ἐστις ὅτι μόνος, κυρίως τυχόντων τῆς θεογονίας, the True and only God, who is properly so called, is but One ; but the second person is dignified with the Communion of Divinity, by his

Δια τὸ μείζονα κατεῖ-
κέν ἐν αὐτῷ Θεὸν πρὶν
ἀναστάτω, δηλαδὴ πατέρα
καὶ τῶν ὅλων Θεόν. p. 225.

his Communication with the true God. With many other Sayings of the like Nature. When therefore Men produce from these Authors, passages to confirm those Doctrines which these Authors do so expressly and frequently disown; they give just Reason to suspect they seek not Truth, but Victory; and are more willing to delude, than to instruct aright the Reader.

H II. My Second Observation is this; that many of those places of the Holy Scripture, which the Post-Nicene Fathers endeavour to interpret to another Sense than the plain and obvious meaning of them does import, are by the Ante-Nicene Fathers interpreted in, and allowed to bear, the obvious meaning of the words. For Instance;

Ist. *There is none Good, but $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ One, that is God,* saith Christ. *There is no Necessity,* saith this Author, *of rendring the Word $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, One Person,* as Dr Clarke supposes: Yet here the Doctor hath the Suffrage of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, who appropriate this $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ to the person of the Father, and hence prove the Supreme Being to be only One. Justin Martyr reads the words thus, *There is One Good*

Dial. cum
Tryph. p.
328.

Good, &
Father
neus th
cu tols
Our Sa
nus, cha
ovga Deo
God. C
Thus, I
rip, but
in Joh.
p. 239.
Sei eu
These
the Fat
to wit,
Justin
proves,
Dai xpi
Father.
from th
warp,
the Fat
Potent
place a
agrees
attribut
Saviour
visible C

Good, ὁ πατήρ ὡς ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, my
 Father which is in Heaven. And Ire-
 neus thus, There is One Good, ὁ πατήρ L. I. c. 17.
 ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, the Father in Heaven.
 Our Saviour, saith Clemens Alexandri-
 nus, characterises the Father, as ὁ ὡς
 ὁ ὡς θεὸς ἁγίος, being the only Good
 God. Origen five times cites the words
 Thus, None is Good, εἰ μὴ ὁ θεὸς ὁ πα-
 τήρ, but God the Father; viz. Comm.
 in Joh. p. 38, 60. contr. Cels. l. 5.
 p. 239. Exhort. ad Martyr. p. 169.
 Σεὶ εὐχῶν, p. 50. Moreover, from
 These words they prove, that God
 the Father Only is to be worshipped,
 to wit, with Supreme Worship. See
 Justin Martyr. Origen from this place
 proves, that ὡς τὸν πατέρα προσεύχε-
 σθαι χρὴ, we ought only to pray to the
 Father. And Clemens Alexandrinus
 from this place proves, that θεὸς ὁ
 πατήρ, εἰς ὃν μόνον πάντες ἱκανοῦνται; God
 the Father, is the One and only Supreme
 Potentate. And lastly, Origen on this
 place asserts, that the word, Good,
 agrees so to God, that it is not to be
 attributed to any other. And that our
 Saviour, as He is the Image of the in-
 visible God; so is he also ὁ ἀκατάρατος
 αὐτὸς

L. I. c. 17.

Stro. 7. p.

733.

Apol. 2. p.

63.

Πσεὶ εὐχ.

p. 50.

Ubi supra.

Comm. in

Math. p.

377.

the Image of his Goodness.
 But then, saith He, there is a more
 like Proportion, *in* *omnibus* *rebus* *de-*
us *et* *omnes*, between the Goodness of
 God, and our Saviour as He is the
 image of his Goodness; *magis* *quam* *in*
Christo *deus* *et* *omnes* *homines*, than be-
 tween the Goodness of our Saviour, and
 a good Man: For greater is the excel-
 lency in our Saviour, as He is the Image
 of the Goodness of God himself, in re-
 spect of inferior good Things; than
 is the excellency of God's Goodness
 compared to our Saviour, who said, my
 Father who sent me is greater than I am.

I proceed,

2^{dly}. To the Comments of some of
 the Ante-Nicene Fathers upon These
 words; Of That Day, and Hour, know-
 eth no Man, no not the Son, Mark 13.
 32, but the Father only, Matth. 24.
 36. The words of Irenæus upon this
 Text are cited by Dr Clarke, and they
 admit of no Evasion; For He evident-
 ly speaks not of the Son of Man, but
 of the Son of God, even of That Son
 with whom (in omnibus pater commu-
 nicat) the Father communicates in all
 things. He adds, that our Lord in
 saying

saying th
 said not
 inferior
 Divine
 without

He said t
 ther is al
 those wo
 greater th
 this Infe
 itaq; pra
 est a Do
 therefore
 Superiour
 Tertullian
 [diem u
 patri not
 known on
 self (saith
 known on
 himself, f
 told the S
 se nescire
 self ignor
 why shou
 of Us to
 thing?

saying this, (dixit quod verum est,) said not what was only true of his Inferiour Nature, and false as to his Divine Nature; but what was true, without Exception: And lastly, that He said this to teach us that the Father is above all things, according to those words of Christ, my Father is greater than I. And hence he makes this Inference, [secundum agnitionem itaq; præpositus esse pater annuntiatu est a Domino nostro,] The Father therefore is by our Lord declared to be Superiour (to him) in Knowledge also. Tertullian calls the day of Retribution, [diem ultimum, & occultum, & soli patri notum,] the last, and hidden day, known only to the Father; And He himself (saith he) is ignorant of the last day, known only to the Father. If our Lord himself, saith Pseudo-Clemens, who foretold the Signs of it; [diem & horam se nescire professus est,] professed himself ignorant of that Day and Hour; why should We think it unworthy of Us to confess our Ignorance in any thing?

De Resur-
rect. car-
nis, c. 22.

adv. prax.
c. 26.

Recogn.
L. 10.
sect. 14.

3. 3dly. *My Father is greater than I*, Joh. 14, 28. All the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, who mention these words, interpret them of the *Divine Nature* of the Father and the Son. So *Irenaeus* in the place fore-cited. *The Father*, saith *Tertullian*, is the whole Substance ; [filius vero derivatio totius, & portio, sicut ipse profitetur, quia pater major me est,] *The Son is a Derivation* from, and a *Portion* of the whole ; as He himself professeth, saying, the Father is greater than I. *Origen* hence proves, that the Father is greater than the Son, [in cognitione,] in Knowledge, in Goodness, (Comm. in Matth. p. 377,) in Glory, (Comm. in Joh. p. 417,) in Essence, Dignity, Power, and Godhead. And This He elsewhere mentions, not as his own private Opinion only, but as the general Doctrine of most *Christians*. For though, saith He, some among so numerous a Multitude, rashly differing from others, may affirm that our Saviour is The God over all, yet so do not We who believe him that said, my Father who sent me is greater than I : For

Adv. prax. cap. 9.

Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς
τοῖς, οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ
λέγουσι, Ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πρῶτος
μὲν καὶ μετὰ μὲν ἐστὶ.
Contr. Cell. l. 8. p. 387.

manifest

manif
tor of
power
p. 2,
this w
my Fa
See, t
c. 22.
Combe
atbl
ternal,
and Fe
true Go
Citation
p. 46,
against
have lea
ἐν τῷ γ
ἡνὸν δε
is the tr
whom he
in the f
vanced i
by the M
Emperou
the Worl
to the Br
as worthy
bly to tha

manifestly declare, the Son of the Creator of this sensible World, is not more powerful than the Father, but ~~καὶ ὡς~~ ^{Ibid. p. 388.} ~~καὶ ὡς~~ ^{inferiour} (in Power) to him: And this we say, believing him who said, my Father who sent me is greater than I. See, to this effect, Novatian de Trin. c. 22. Methodius conviv. Orat. apud Combef. p. 101. Pass we on

4thly, to John 17, 3, This is Life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou (the only true God) hast sent. Here, to Dr Clarke's Citation from Origen, Comm. in Joh. pag. 133. p. 46, I add, that in his third Book against Celsus, he saith, The Christians have learned, that eternal Life consists ἐν τῷ γινώσκειν τὸ μόνον ἐπὶ πάντων ἀληθινὸν θεόν, in knowing him, who alone is the true God over all, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent: Of whom He saith in the same page, that he was not advanced into the number of the Gods by the Magicians, or the Decree of the Emperours; but that He that made the World, commended him to the Breasts of Believers, as worthy of Honour, suitably to that miraculous Pow-

Ἀκολουθῶς τῇ ἐν τῷ
λεγεῖν περὶ τῆς πίστεως
δυνάμει, συνεσήκων αὐτὴν
ὡς τιμῆς ἀξίον.

er which He shewed in Confirmation of his Doctrine. It is easy to show, saith **L. 2. c. 12** Irenaeus, that there is One God over all, [ex ipsis Domini verbis consentientis unum patrem, & factorem mundi, & plasmatorem hominis, — & alterum nescientis, & hunc esse super omnia Deum,] from the very Words of our Lord, confessing One Father and Maker of the World, and Former of Man, declared by the Law and the Prophets, acknowledging him to be The God over all, and knowing no other. In his third **cap. 6.** Book He prays, that we Christians may know Thee, who hast made Heaven and Earth, and rulest over all, [qui es solus & verus Deus,] who art the Only and True God, over whom there is no other God; through our Lord Jesus Christ: And grant to all that read this Writing, to know thee, [quia solus Deus es,] that thou art The Only **L. 6. cap. 23.** God. Christ, say the Apostolical Constitutions, (which, though a spurious Book, yet expresses the Sense of Antiquity,) did not dissolve the Law of Nature, but confirmed it; for He who had said in the Law, the Lord thy God is One Lord, said also in the Gospel

spel, the true God that the of God Begin comman Father ship him only P thers, not hav Father doth i [Est er scriptam num ve misit Je We mus Rule pre Lord G Christ w The san credere, Dei, — lus est, um,] tea Father, That G God, to

spel, that they may know Thee, the only true God. Eusebius saith,

that the only-begotten Son of God, the First-born, and Beginning of all things,

Τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ φύσιν
γεννητὸν Θεὸν ἀληθινόν,
καὶ μόνον ὁμολογούμενον, ἡμῶν καὶ
πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὴν. Prepar. E.
cap. 1. §. 15.

commands us to account his

Father the Only true God, and to Wor-

ship him alone. Novatian, who is the only Person of all the Ante-Nicene Fa-

thers, who saith that Christ would not have joined himself with God the

Father here, if He had not been God; doth in the very same place add,

[Est ergo credendum secundum præ-

scriptam (Regulam) in Dominum u-

num verum Deum, & in eum quem misit Jesum Christum consequenter,]

We must therefore, according to the Rule prescribed, believe in the One true

Lord God, and consequently in Jesus Christ whom He hath sent. And again:

The same Rule of Truth, [docet nos credere, post patrem, etiam in filium Dei, — hujus Dei qui & unus, & solus est, conditor scilicet rerum omni-

um,] teacheth us to believe, after the Father, in the Son of God, even of That God who is the One and only God, to wit, the Maker of all things.

So

So that *All* the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers may truly be esteemed to concur in the *Sense* given of these *four* Texts ; not one of them, as far as I can learn, ever attempting to put any other *Sense* upon them.

III.

III. I Observe, that many other places which This Author endeavours to rescue from *Dr Clarke's* *Sense*, and to interpret agreeably to his own *Sense* ; are, by most of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, interpreted in favour of the *D.* Thus, *Mark* 12, 29, Our Lord saith, *This is the first of all the Commandments, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord : And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, &c.* And from this great Command-

Apol. 2. p. 63.

ment, *Iustin Martyr* proves that *Θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν*, God alone is to be worshipped, to wit, with Supreme Worship. And that he who worships

Dialog. p. 321.

God with his whole Heart, *ἐδρα αἰνον λεγούσας Θεόν*, will worship no other God : Only He will worship that Angel who is beloved by this Lord and God, *Θεὸς ἐυλομένους*, God commanding that he should do so. *Irenæus* saith, that

l. 4. c. 2.

Christ owns the *Maker of Heaven and Earth,*

Earth,
to be b
declares
Lord t
likewise
saith Ch
Hear,
one Lor
wee, &
be is
Good.

But h
consider
signed t
ment o
Words
One, do
clude th

which p
sage fro
tit, cum
& Domi
things, i
ly stiled,
Grabe's
[Cum, D
expunct
Particle
MSS ;

Earth, whom the Prophets preached, to be his Father, and whom the Law declares, saying, Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord. Origen likewise: There is one only truly Good, saith Christ; of whom the Law saith, Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord; *οὐκ ἑστὶν ἄλλος θεὸς ἢ ὁ κύριος* Comm: in Mach. p. 378. *καὶ ὁ κύριος ἁγιάδος ἱσθ. ἕστ.* for he is properly Saviour, Lord, and Good.

But here I must divert a little, to consider this Author's Citations designed to prove, that, in the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers, the Words [*Solus*] Alone, and [*unus*] One, do not exclude, but rather do include the Word, or Son of God. *pag. 61*

To which purpose He cites first this Passage from Irenæus; [*is qui omnia fecit, cum verbo suo, iuste dicatur Deus & Dominus Solus;*] He who made all things, is, together with his Word, justly stiled, Lord and God Alone. But Dr Grabe's Note upon the place is this: [*Cum, Deest in Arundel. Hoc autem expuncto, alius exurgit sensus,*] the Particle Cum, is not in the Arundel MSS; which being taken away, another

ther Sense ariseth, namely, that God
 made all things with his Word; for by
 the Word of the Lord were the Heavens
 made, and all the Host of them by the
 Breath of his Mouth. And so it ac-
 cords with the beginning of that
 Chapter which saith, [Neq; Prophe-
 ta, neq; Apostoli alium Deum nomi-
 naverunt vel Dominum appellaverunt,
 præter verum & solum Deum; multo
 magis (hoc non fecit) ipse Dominus.]
 Neither the Prophets, nor the Apostles
 called any other Person Lord or God,
 besides the True and Only God; much
 less did our Lord himself any such thing.
 I blush to mention his Citation from
 Origen against Celsus, l. 8. p. 386; it
 being evident to all who understand
 Greek, that, from p. 385 to 388, O-
 rigen not only confutes His Sense,
 but declares that the generality of
 Christians did reject it: Nor doth O-
 rigen say, as his Citation doth sug-
 gest, We worship One God, the Father
 and the Son, but *εἷς ὁ θεός, ὡς ἀμδιό-
 τητος, Ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς θεοῦ αὐτοῦ
 ὡς, We worship the Father and the Son,
 one God, in the manner we have decla-
 red them to be, viz. Two Subsistences,*

but

but
 regard
 and C
 worshi
 Son
 Thing
 one in
 Will.
 those
 p. 70,
 puts be
 the S
 quotes
 shows
 One on
 Tertull
 Wisdon
 tus]
 non ex
 produce
 is [sen
 ens,]
 wise;
 ly in h
 Person.
 himself
 His lat
 introdu
 not to

but so One, as all Believers had ~~by~~ ^{One Heart} and One Soul: And a little after, We worship the Father of Truth, and the Son who is the Truth, being two Things in Subsistence or Substance, but one in Concord, Consent, and in unity of Will. Which Words, compared with those in his Commentary on St. John, p. 70, show the great difference Origen puts between the Father of Truth, and the Son who is Truth. Next he quotes Tertullian saying, the Father Adv. Prax. c. 18. shows himself [unicum, sed cum filio,] One only, but with the Son: But there Tertullian speaks of the Son, and of Wisdom, not as begotten, and [prolatus] brought forth, but as [in ipso, non extra ipsum,] being in him, not produced from him; namely, as God is [semper rationalis, & semper sapiens,] always rational, and always wise; in which respect He could be only in him as an Attribute, not as a Person. And thus He largely explains himself, chap. 5, 6, 7, of that Book. His last Witness is Novatian, who is introduc'd, as Tertullian was before, not to interpret the Words of Christ,

but of the Pharisee. But then of
 Cap. 4: God in the next Chapter He declares,
 that *He is* [Deus Summus, dum extra
 comparem est; & ideo solum & u-
 num esse necesse est, cui conferri nihil
 potest dum parem non habet;] *The Su-
 preme God without any Peer, and there-
 fore necessarily the One and Only God,
 to whom nothing can be compared, there
 being none equal to him.* But of the
 Cap. 17: Son he saith; *Tho' He was in the Form
 of God, [nunquam se Deo patri, aut
 comparavit aut contulit,] He never com-
 pared himself to God the Father; as
 being mindful that He was from the
 Father; and that whatsoever he was,
 He had, because the Father had given
 it; [Ex quo probatur, nunquam ar-
 bitratum illum esse rapinam quandam
 Divinitatem, ut æquaret se patri Deo;]
 whence it is proved that he never thought
 fit to challenge to himself such a Divi-
 nity, as should render him equal to the
 Father; but on the contrary, He became
 obedient and subject to him. And last-
 ly, he spends his 31st Chapter to prove
 that God the Father and the Son
 make not Two Gods, because the Son
 is not equal to the Father. For though
 this*

this A
 Print
 jus sic
 dissona
 reddid
 declare
 Gods,
 yet it
 Words
 merito
 they
 Gods,
 whole
 must
 In
 us Chr
 wit) t
 all thi
 Lord
 all th
 faith
 and th
 nia, a
 things
 all th
 from t
 ther o
 and, h
 stingu

this Author takes advantage of a false Print in citing these Words thus, [*cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantia, aut inequalitate, duos Deos reddidisse videatur,*] *whose Divinity is so declared, as that he did not make Two Gods, by a Disagreement or Inequality;* yet it is manifest from the preceding Words, [*æquales inventi duos Deos merito reddidissent,*] *being found Equal,* they would indeed have made Two Gods, and from the Design of the whole Chapter, that the true Reading must be, [*æqualitate,*] *Equality.*

In 1 Cor. 8, 6, are these Words; *To us Christians there is but One God (to wit) the Father, &c. &c., from whom are all things, and we from him; and One Lord Jesus Christ, &c. &c., by whom are all things, and we by him.* Now saith Tertullian, speaking of the Son and the Father, [*Alius per quem omnia, alius a quo,*] *He by whom are all things is One, and He from whom are all things is Another.* And Irenæus from these Words proves, that the Father of all things is called, and is God; and, having recited the Words, *He distinguisheth,* saith He, *and separates*
those

Adv. prax.
cap. 21.

L. 3. c. 6.
p. 209,
210.

those that are called Gods, but are not so, [ab uno Deo patre ex quo omnia, & unum Dominum Jesum Christum ex sua persona firmissime confessus est,] from that One God the Father of whom are all things; and He himself firmly confesseth One Lord Jesus Christ. In those Words, saith Eusebius, *μὴν ὁ θεός*, after One God, Christ is pronounced One Lord; and, *μὴν ὁ κύριος*, after the God over all, the Lord of all things.

Contr.
Marcel. l.
I. c. 20.
p. 93.

Eph. 4; 4, 5, 6, follows; Where saith the Apostle, v. 4, *There is One Body*, and *ἓν πνεῦμα*, One Spirit, v. 5, *ἓν κύριος*, One Lord, v. 6, *One God, and Father, who is over all*, and *ὁ θεὸς μετὰ ὑμᾶς*, with all, and in you all. From these words, the Fathers of the Fourth and the Fifth Century observe, that there is no strength in the Criticism of the Arians saying, that *ὁ θεός*, is appropriated to the Father, and *ὁ κύριος* to the Son; because Both are here attributed to the Father. [Which yet is not so; For *ὁ θεὸς μετὰ ὑμᾶς*, is not the same as *ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ*.] But this Gentleman hath spoiled their Observation, by attempting to prove from Irenæus, that under One God the Father

Father
is the
is in
and
natus
if the
ther
Chapt
sum fi
cified
must
He a
& ver
that
the C
a patro
madm
that th
the Sp
Irenæu
saith
the M
over
Jesus
[Quon
domin
Paulus
ter qu
in om

Father is contained the Word, who is through all, and the Spirit which is in all. But this is a very false and ridiculous Interpretation of Irenæus's Words here, and elsewhere. For if the Word be contained in the Father; seeing Irenæus saith in this Chapter, that this word was [*suspen-* L. 5. cap. 18.
sum super lignum, & crucifixum,] crucified and hanged upon a Tree; he must be a Patro-Passian; and when He adds, [*pater conditionem simul, & verbum portat,*] he must mean that the Father sustains himself, and the Creation; and [*verbum portatum a patre, præstat Spiritum omnibus quemadmodum vult pater,*] must signify, that the word sustained by himself, gives the Spirit to all, as He himself wills. Irenæus cites these words to prove, saith the Title of the Chapter, that the Maker of all things, who is God over all, is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: His words are these; [*Quoniam autem hic Deus est pater* L. 2. cap. 3.
domini nostri J. Christi, & de hoc
Paulus Apostolus dixit, unus Deus pater qui super omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus nobis,] This God is the Father

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and concerning Him, Paul the Apostle saith, One God, the Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. This He repeats, l. 4. c. 37. proving, that there is One God, to wit, the Father; from these words of Malachi, [Nonne unus pater est omnium nostrorum,] *Have we not All One Father?* And from these words of the Apostle; and the following words of Christ, [Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo,] *All things are delivered unto me of my Father.* And Chapter 52, He plainly distinguishes This Lord from the Father, by citing the Words thus, [Unus Dominus, & unus Pater, &c.] *there is One Lord, and One Father.*

As for those words, *Matth. 6, 9, Our Father which art in Heaven*; Irenaeus l. 4. c. i. saith, *Our Lord commanded us to call none Father, but our Father who is in Heaven*, [Qui est unus Deus, & unus Pater,] *Who is the One God, and One Father.* Origen hence urges, that Christians ought to pray to God the Father only. And Tertullian saith; *The Son prayed to, and asked of the Father in Heaven, and taught us to pray*
 looking

τελειωχ.
 p. 48, 49,
 50.
 Adv. prax.
 cap. 23.

looking
 Caelis,
 ven. B
 in his
 saith,
 Son is
 ing th
 quidem
 Mother
 whence
 that t
 with
 i Ti
 Media
 Man C
 Origen
 bath
 who is
 we ma
 our Pr
 is of
 betwix
 gotten
 or beg
 Blessin
 manne
 our Pr
 him

looking thither; [Pater Noster qui es in Cælis,] Our Father, which art in Heaven. But, saith this Layman, Tertullian *pag. 36.* in his Discourse on the Lord's Prayer saith, [In patre filius invocatur,] The Son is invoked in the Father; concealing the words following, [Ne mater quidem Ecclesia præteritur,] Nor is our Mother the Church passed by: From whence, I hope, he will not argue, that the Church is one in Essence with God the Father. *De Orat. cap. 2.*

1 Tim. 2, 5, There is One God, and One Mediatour betwixt God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. Of this Mediatour, Origen speaks thus: Christ hath brought us to Him who is God over all; that we may Honour him with our Prayers, as by one who is of a middle Nature betwixt him who is unbegotten, and all things that are made or begotten; bringing down to us the Blessings of the Father; and, after the manner of an High-Priest, presenting our Prayers, *πρὸς τὸν ἐν παντί Θεόν*, to him who is God over all, Eusebius

πρὸς τὸν ἐν παντί Θεόν πᾶν μετ' εὐχαρίων ὡς προσευχόμενοι αὐτῷ, ὡς διὰ μεταξέοντο τῆς τῆ ἀγνότητος, καὶ τῆς τῶν κτισμάτων πάντων φύσεως.
Contr. Cels. l. 3. p. 131.

E

upon

upon these words of the *Apostle* to the *Galatians*, *A Mediatour is not a Mediatour of One*, faith thus :

Ὁυτὶ ἄρα ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος ὢν
 ὁ μόνος, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ
 ἑαυτοῦ γέννηται ὁ μόνος ;
 Contr. Marcell. p. 8.

God himself cannot be a Mediatour ; for whose Mediatour should he be ? A Mediatour betwixt God and

Angels, must be, ἰστέμενος ἐκείνων, neither of them ; So that He neither can be esteemed the God over all, nor one of the Angels, but μέσος, one of a middle Nature between both : And in like manner, a Mediatour betwixt God and Man, being of a middle Rank between both, is Neither of them, being neither The One and Only God, nor a Man like to other Men. Where note, that both Origen, and Eusebius, only deny this Mediatour to be ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μόνος, the God over all, or the One only God : Which, faith Eusebius, if the Son of God were, He must be a Mediatour betwixt Himself and Man ; and so must offer up our Prayers, and be our High-Priest to Himself. But they deny not, but Both frequently confess, that he had a Divine Nature united to his Human, and so had ἰδίαν οὐκ ἐκείνου τῆς ἰσότητος, [pro-

prium

prium
 ticipa
 us.
 Hippo
 thoug
 tur c
 Man,
 Sectio
 ' om
 ' illa
 ' tem.
 One o
 Peer.
 tullia
 beside
 tis,]
 Spirit
 are P
 Medi
 IV
 upon
 moni
 Sense
 by fo
 interp
 ny of
 his p
 To ta
 they

prium consortium utrisq;] a true Participation of Both, according to Irenaeus. And This is all that Novatian, Hippolitus, and St Cyprian say; who, though he affirms that [Deus miscetur cum homine,] God is mixt with Man, yet in the immediate foregoing Section declares, that [*Unus est* De Idolorum vanitate. sect. 10.
omnium Dominus Deus, neq; enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortium,] The Lord God of all things is One only, for that Sublimity can have no Peer. Our Author's Citation from Tertullian, [De Resurrectione carnis,] is beside the Purpose: For [utriusq; partis,] both Parts, is only [carnis & Spiritus,] Flesh and Spirit; which are Both to obtain Salvation by this Mediatour.

IV. I observe, that all those Texts, IV upon which he produces some Testimonies of the Fathers to confirm his Sense and Interpretation of them, are by some of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers interpreted to another Sense; And many of them are either insufficient for his purpose, or else make against him. To take them in the order in which they lie in Scripture.

Pag. 43.

1st. He cites Luke 1, 17, *He shall be great before the Lord. v. 15, And many of the Sons of Israel shall be turn to the Lord their God. v. 17, For he shall go before him, i. e. before Christ the Son of God, Mar. 1; 1, 2, to prepare his way, to make ready a People prepared for the Lord.* Here indeed he abounds with Testimonies from *Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertulian, the Synod of Antioch, Novatian, and Eusebius*; but they are none of them pertinent to his purpose; and, as *Dr Clarke* hath proved, all evidently conclude against him. His Citation from *Irenaeus* is indeed pertinent, but then it plainly makes *against* him, by saying this Prophet was great *in the sight of the Lord Christ*, and was to *prepare his way*; For he plainly distinguisheth *him* from the Lord God of the Sons of Israel, who as yet had no knowledge of *Christ* as their Lord or God. Moreover this Lord

* L. 3. c. 11. p. 214, is styled the Son [* Dei Altissimi] of the *most High God*, and That Lord who col. 2. 216, should give Remission of Sins to those col. 1. 217, who were [conversi ad Deum] turned col. 1. 218, to God; The Son of him, [qui est so-

lus

lus
[unu
the
Testa
Omni
omni
who
who
2.
In the
the W
was G
by him
us a p
ginnin
Sabelli
drinus
is plain
fage, b
nus, h
him not
an Art
Omni
ed. C
that S
cording
Tongue
ticle, a

lus Deus,] *who alone is God, who is*
 [unus Deus] *the One God, who by*
 the Advent of his Son declared his
 Testament : Who is [Unus Deus
 Omnipotens qui per verbum suum
 omnia fecit,] *the One God Almighty*
who made all things by his Word, and
who is One God and Father.

2. The Second is, *John 1 ; 1, 2, 3,*
In the Beginning was the Word, and
the Word was with God, and the Word
was God. Ver. 3. All things were made
by him, &c. And here he only gives pag. 52.
 us a piece of a Sentence, without Be-
 ginning or End, from *Irenæus* ; and a
Sabellian Saying from *Clemens Alexan-*
drinus, in his *Paedagogus*, where he
 is plainly a *Sabellian*. In another pas-
 sage, being better instructed by *Pante-*
mus, he saith, *He calls*
him not absolutely God with
an Article, by which the
Omnipotent God is signifi-
ed. *Origen* informs us,
 that *St John* useth the Articles ac-
 cording to the accuracy of the Greek
 Tongue, sometimes adding the Ar-
 ticle, and sometimes omitting it ;
 for

Οὐ γὰρ Θεὸν ἀπαλῶς
 προσεῖπεν, ὅτι τῇ τῷ ἀρ-
 θρῷ προτιθέτω τὸν παντοκ-
 ράτορα δηλώσας. *SICRO. 3.*
p. 460.

ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁνομασία
ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγαθῷ τέσσεται
τῶν ὅλων ἀγαθῶν, τίς οὖν ὁ
ἐν ᾧ ὁ θεὸς ὁνομα-
ζεται. Comm. in Joh. p.
46, 47.

for (says he) He adds the
Article when the word
God is put for the unbe-
gotten Cause of all things,
or for ὁ ἐν παντί θεός, the
God over all; but he omits

it when the Word is called God. God
with an Article, signifies him that is
God of himself, or αὐτοθεός; as in
that Prayer of Christ's, *That they may
know Thee the only true God*: But Any
other who is God by Participation of
His Divinity, is properly God with-
out an Article. The Word excelleth
all others; but yet ὑπερχούμενος τῷ
ᾧ ὅλων θεῷ is excelled by the God of
the Universe.

And this answers the Words of
L. 2. c. 12. *Irenæus*, [Immo magis ipse Deus, cum
sit verbum,] *nam, rather God himself,*
since he is the Word. For Origen him-
self, and almost all the *Ante-Nicene*
Fathers, allow him to be God, but not
The God over all, or God of the same
Numerical Essence with the Father.
Not *Irenæus*; who says in his Preface
to this second Book, that there is
[Unus Deus conditor,] One God the

Make

Make
And,
Word
over
for C
sions

I
upon
Body
that t
interpr
by the

Word
Rati
Word
was God

got him,
Creation
ving cite
faith, th
whence sp
Word, re
the Father
all things
Word wa

Maker of all, and there is no Other ;
And, chap. 3d, he proves from the
Words of St Paul, that this One God
over all, is the Father of our Lord Je-
sus Christ : With many other Expres-
sions of the like Nature.

I have one thing more to add
upon this Text, which scarce any
Body hath taken Notice of, viz.
that two of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers
interpret these Words thus ; that
by them St John signifies, that *ἐν* Theophi-
πρώτῳ λόγῳ *ἦν ὁ θεός, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ* lus. l. 2.
λόγῳ, at first God was alone, and his p. 100.
Word was in him, he being always *λογι-
κός*, Rational ; *ἔπειτα λέγει, ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ
λόγος*, and after that, he says the Word
was God, to wit, when *τῶν καὶ λόγον
ἔκτισεν* *προφωτισμένον*, by Prolation he be-
got him, as the First-born of the whole
Creation. Methodius ha-
ving cited these Words,
saith, the Beginning from
whence sprang the most true
Word, we must say was
the Father and Maker of
all things, in whom the
Word was ; And these

Τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴν, ἀφ'
ἧς ἀνεβλάσθη ὁ ὁρδόμε-
τος λόγος, τὴν πατέρα,
καὶ ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων φα-
τέον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν. Apud
Photium cod. 236. p. 939.

Τὸ ἱερωτικὸν τῷ λό-
γῳ ὁ ἔχει παρὰ τῷ πα-
τρί, καὶ περὶ τῷ τὴν κόσ-
μον εἰς γένεσιν παρελ-
θῆν. Ibid.

Words,

Words, *He was in the Beginning with God*, import the *Principality* which he had with the Father before the *Creation of the World*. For after his own Father, who is ἀναρχος ἀρχή, the *undervived Principle of all things*, ἐστὶ ἀρχὴ τῶν ἄλλων γίνεται δι' ἡς πάντα δημιουργούνται, *He is the Beginning of all other things, by which all things were framed*. On the third Verse,

Δι' εἰ, ἔκδοτος τὴν
πρώτην χώραν ἔχει, δι-
πρῶτον δὲ αἰ. Comm. in
Joh. p. 55.

Origen saith, the *Particle δι' εἰ*, by or through whom; never relates to the principal, but always to the second or ministerial

Cause. Thus when the *Apostle* saith, *In the last days God spake to us by his Son*, δι' εἰ, *By whom he made the World*; the *Particle δι' εἰ*, is applied to

οὐχ ὑπὸ τῷ λόγῳ
ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ κρείτ-
τοντος καὶ μείζοντος πατρὸς
τὸν λόγον· τίς δ' αὖ ἄλ-
λ' ἐστὶ τυγχάνει ἢ ὁ
πατήρ; ibid. p. 56.

the *Son*: And so, saith he, is it here; For though all things were made ἐκ τῷ λόγῳ, by the ministry of the *Word*, yet were they not made ὑπὸ τῷ λόγῳ, by

the *Word* as the principal Cause, but by *One* more excellent and greater than the *Word*; And *What* other can be better than the *Father*?

The

The Doctor hath given us a very ^{Scripture-Doctrine, pag. 89.} pertinent Citation from *Eusebius*, *Eccles. Theol. l. i. c. 20. p. 84.* To which he might have added this: *The Evangelist doth not say all things were made ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, of or from him, but δι' αὐτοῦ by him; ἡ δὲ λέξις λειτουργίας, ἢ λειτουργικὸν σημαίνει, Contr. Marcell. l. 2. c. 14.* now the Article *λέξις*, signifies *Ministration*. And this in effect *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, and most of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* mean by saying, that the Son did ὑπεργενεῖν, ὑπερετεῖν, λειτουργεῖν, [*ministrare patri,*] minister to the Father, in the Creation of the World; Whence after the *Nicene-Council*, they began to exclaim against these Sayings, as impious and absurd. Hence when *Eusebius* had ^{Hist. Eccles. l. i. c. 2.} called the Son ὑπεργενεῖν καὶ ὑπερετεῖν τῷ ὑπὸ ἡγουμένῳ θεῷ, *The Minister of that God who is Lord over the World*, the Greek Scholiast cries out, ἀπαρτὸς ἀλόγιμα, reject with Detestation the Absurdity; for the Divine Fathers do not own the Son to be the Minister of the Father, but profess him

F him

him to be Con-substantial, Co-eternal,
and EQUAL IN POWER to him.

Lib. 5. c.
6.

Thus when the Apostolical Constitutions say, that Christ at the Creation of the World did α̅ ποσειτα̅ν, that which he was commanded to do; (which, though itself a spurious Book, yet herein manifestly uses the Language of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Novatian, Lactantius, and many others;) the old Scholiast calls it, βλάσφημον, Blasphemous: For, saith he, before he took Flesh upon him, ε̅ ποσειτα̅ν ο̅ υ̅ος, the Son was not commanded. And when in the last Chapter they introduce the Son, ὑπερετα̅μενον τῷ θεῷ αὐτῷ, ε̅ πατε̅ρ, εἰς τῷ ὅλων δημιουργίῳ, ministring to God his Father in the Creation of all things; the Scholiast saith, I allow not that he ministred to God the Father, but say that he made all things with him. And when they repeat the same Words, This Annotator adds, After his Incarnation it may be said he ministred, but not before it. Now what more pregnant Evidence can be given of a change of Doctrine,

L. 8. c.
12.

trine,
Rejec
rally
thers,
or L
wards
furd?

3d
5, 18
he ca
own F
God;
they
being
doubt
answer
here f
the F
tion o
Jews
nity o
tyr's I
ly aga
particu
wherea
ε̅ α̅
Christ

trine, than is afforded us by this Rejection of the Language so generally used by the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, without Exception, Caution, or Limitation; as becoming afterwards Impious, Blasphemous, and Absurd?

3dly. To his Arguments from *John* pag. 58. 3.
 5, 18, where the Jews object that he called God *ἰδιον παντα*, his own Father, making himself equal with God; and from chap. 10, 58, where pag. 69.
 they say they stone him because he being a Man made himself God; I doubt not but he will receive a full answer from Dr Clarke. My Notes here shall be only two. 1st. That the Fathers here deny the Foundation of his Argument, viz. that the Jews had any Opinion of the Divinity of their Messiah. *Justin Martyr's* Disputation with *Trypho* is plainly against him in this Matter: And particularly those Words of *Trypho*; pag. 267.
whereas you say, προπαρχειν θεον οντα
αε αἰώνων τετον ἢ χερσον, that your Christ existed, being God, before all
 F 2 Ages,

Ages, and then was pleased to be
born a Man, and was not Man of
Man only; this seems to me not on-
ly incredible, but even foolish. To
this, Justin answers; I know this

seems an incredible saying, καὶ μὴ
λίστα τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν, especially
to Men of your Nation. A Jew,
saith Origen, will not confess that
any of their Prophets said, ἦξεν θεὸς
ὑμῶν, that the Son of God should come:
That which they say, is this, ὅτι ἦξει
ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, that the Christ of
God shall come. And again, I have
disputed with many Jews reputed wise,
but found none of them who would
own, λόγον ἔστι τὸν θεόν τοῦ θεοῦ, that the
Word was the Son of God. The
Citation This Author brings from
Eusebius, hath been fully answered
already: And That from Novatian,
makes against him; For, saith he,
when they said we stoned thee for
Blasphemy, because thou being a Man
makest thy self God, [‘ Distinctionem
‘ posuit dominus in ratione reddenda
‘ quomodo se Deum dixisset; quem
‘ pater, inquit, sanctificavit, & misit

Contr.
Cels. l. 1.
p. 38.

L. 2. p.
79.

C. 22.

‘ in
‘ cip
‘ patr
‘ sequ
‘ nim
‘ diff
‘ tem
‘ ficat
‘ patr
‘ so f
‘ um
‘ Miss
‘ per
‘ min
‘ fed
‘ utiq
‘ tem
‘ ri D
‘ distinct
‘ self Go
‘ ther t
‘ sent an
‘ fore b
‘ the Fa
‘ ther.—
‘ himself
‘ This O
‘ came a

in hunc mundum. Dum ergo ac-
 cipit sanctificationem a patre, minor
 patre est : Minor autem patre con-
 sequenter est, sed filius : pater e-
 nim si fuisset, sanctificationem de-
 disset, non accepisset. Et nunc au-
 tem, profitendo se accepisse sancti-
 ficationem a patre ; hoc ipso, quo
 patre se minorem, accipiendo ab ip-
 so sanctificationem, probat ; se fili-
 um esse, non patrem, monstravit.
 Missum propterea se esse dicit, ut
 per hanc obedientiam, qua venit Do-
 minus Christus missus, non pater
 sed filius probetur ; qui misisset
 utiq; si pater fuisset ; Missus au-
 tem non fuit pater, subditus alte-
 ri Deo dum mittitur ;] *he by a*
distinction shows how he called him-
self God ; to wit, because the Fa-
ther to whom he was subject, had
sent and sanctified him : Seeing there-
fore he receives Sanctification from
the Father, he is less than the Fa-
ther.—And he therefore says of
himself that he was sent, that by
This Obedience whereby our Lord Christ
came as a person sent, he might be
shown

shown to be, not the Father, but the Son, &c. From which Words we plainly learn, that though Novatian owned Christ to be God; he doth as plainly say, that he was less than his Father, and obedient to him, and subject to another, by being sent by him. And to the same purpose he saith, chap. 21, [‘ Quid tam evidens esse potest hunc non patrem esse sed filium, quàm quod obediens Patri Deo proponitur, ne si Pater esse credatur, alteri jam Deo patri Christus subjectus esse dicatur?] What can more evidently show that he was not the Father, but the Son, than this; that he is represented as Obedient to God the Father? For had Christ been the Father, he must have been thought Subject to another Father. Where again he represents him as always obedient and subject to his Father.

4. pag. 65. 4thly. John 10, 30, *I and the Father are One.*] Here the Ante-Nicene Fathers Dial. cum are numerous, who assert with Ju- Tryph. p. 276. *stin Martyr*, that the Son and Father are

are du
ber,
the C
ther,
Subsist
cord C
are T
in Un
of W
is the
the Fa
Father
Alexan
denotin
stence
the Son
They a
the Fa
the Spin
of Orig
Son are
tum hab
so they
knit int
saith, I

are δύο ἀριθμοί, ἡ γυνή, two in Number, though one in Will; and, with the Council of Antioch, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, τῇ ᾧ συμφωνία ἐν, three in Subsistence or Substance, but in Concord One. With Origen, That they are Two things in Substance, but One in Unanimity, and Concord, and Unity of Will; and that this Unity in Will is the cause why Christ saith, I and the Father are One. Christ said, the Father and the Son are One, saith Alexander Bishop of Alexandria; not denoting that two Natures in Subsistence were but one Nature, but that the Son exactly preserved ἡ πατέρι, the likeness of the Father. They also add, with Athenagoras, that the Father and the Son are One, ἐνότητι καὶ πνεύματι, by the Unity of the Spirit. According to those Words of Origen: As the Father and the Son are One, [sic qui unum Spiritum habent, in unionem coarctantur,] so they who have One Spirit, are knit into Union; For our Saviour saith, I and the Father are One. And,

Apud Socr. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 10.

Contr. Cels. l. 8. p. 385, 386, & Comm. in Joh. p. 227.

Apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 3.

pag. 10.

Hom. 9, in Ezek. p. 148.

And, Holy Father, I pray that as thou and I are One, so they may be One in us ; signifying, that Virtue makes One of many. And to Marcellus pleading these Words for his Sabellianism, I and the Father are One, Eusebius answers ; this is not so to be understood, that [the λόγος,] the Word, was ἐνώμενος τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ ὄντι συναφθισμένους, united and conjoined in Essence with the Father ; but, according to his Prayer, that his Disciples might be One, as I, Father, am in thee, and thou in me.

Ecclef.
Theol. l. 3.

To proceed now to His Authorities. His first from Irenæus, hath been already answered. His two passages from Clemens are quoted from his *Pædagogus*, where He is a Sabellian ; And I oppose to them two other passages in his later Works, which do as plainly contradict them, viz. Peter saith well in his Prædication, there is One God, ὁ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀπαρχὴ πάντων τῶν πραγμάτων, who made the Beginning of all things, signifying thereby his First-begotten Son. The

Stro. 6. p.
644.

The
Chr.
Doct.
Disci.
Supre.
Life,
him,
fore
ternal
eterna
sings,
& aya.
the M
to kno
ἐκείνον,
our Sa
tur.
7.

His
lian, re
ing no
our ba
which r
Father
stantiæ,
is only
know no

The second passage is this ; *When Christ was called Good, he begins a Doctrine converting the Minds of his Disciples to the Good God who is the Supreme, the only Dispenser of eternal Life, which the Son receiving from him, gives to us : The greatest therefore of all Instructions relating to eternal Life, is this ; to know this eternal God, the giver of eternal Blessings, & αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς, ὁ ἕως ἄνω, ὁ ὑψίστος, & ἀγαθὸς θεός, the Supreme, the One, the Most High and Good God ; and to know τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ ὀντοπῶς, μετ' ἐκείνου, after him, the Greatness of our Saviour. Quis dives salvabitur. Apud Combef. p. 166. §. 6, 7.*

His Second Citation from Tertulian, reacheth not the Point ; seeing no Man denies that our Saviour *had a Divine Nature*. The First, which refers This saying, *I and the Father are One*, [ad unitatem substantiæ,] to the *Unity of Substance* ; is only apt to delude them who know not that the Fathers by that

G Phrase,

Cap. 8:

Phrase, understood not a *Numerical*, but only a *Specific* Unity. And that this only was the meaning of *Tertullian*, appears from two passages in the same Book. *God brought forth the Word*, [sicut radix fruticem, & fons fluvium, & Sol radium,] as the Root brings forth the Stalk, the Fountain the River, and the Sun a Ray. [Secundum horum exemplorum formam, profiteor me duos dicere, Deum & Sermonem ejus; patrem, & filium ipsius: Nam & radix & frutex duæ res sunt, sed conjunctæ; & fons & fluvius duæ species sunt, sed indivisæ; & sol & radius duæ formæ sunt, (i. e. naturæ, l. i. contr. Marcion. c. ii. p. 370,) sed cohærentes.] Now, saith he, after the form of these Examples, I profess to own the Father and Son to be two; for the Root and Stalk are two things, but they are joined together; the Fountain and the River are two Species, but they are undivided; the Sun and its Ray are two Natures, but they are coherent. Where he plainly grants the Father and

and
Spec
are
joined
gain,
of the
Sun;
whose
not pr
the Sun
not ma
the Su
two Th
cies of
stance,
Word,
Where
the Son
in Spec
Novat
gainst hi
relates to
Opinion,
Father an
cord, and
well unde
when he sa
ing himself

and the Son to be two Things, two Species, two Natures, though they are Both coherent, undivided, and joined together. And again, I will call a Ray of the Sun separately the Sun; but naming the Sun whose the Ray is, I will not presently call the Ray the Sun: For though I do not make two Suns, yet the Sun and its Ray are two Things, and two Species of one undivided Substance, as God and his Word, the Father and the Son, are: Where again he owns the Father and the Son, to be two Things, and two in Species.

Novatian, here quoted, is plainly against him: For he saith, that *this Unity* Cap. 22. *relates to the Concord, the Agreement of Opinion, the Society of Love; so that the Father and the Son are rightly One by Concord, and by Love: And that St Paul well understood this Unity of Concord, when he said to the Corinthians concerning himself and Apollos; he that plant-*

Nam & radium Solis, scorsum solem vocabo; solem autem nominans, cujus est radius, non statim & radium solem appellabo: Nam etsi soles duos non faciam, tamen & solem & radium ejus, tam duas res, & duas species unius indivisæ substantiæ numerabo, quàm Deum & Sermonem ejus, quàm Patrem & Filium. Adv. Prax. c. 13.

eth; and be that watereth are One: For Paul and Apollos were unquestionably Two, as to their Persons; but One in Faith, Opinion, and Religion. Here, saith Pamelius, he [Novatian] writes not with sufficient Caution, making no mention of the Communion of the Father and the Son in Essence, and producing an Example from 1 Cor. 3, 8, [unitati essentiae veluti contrarium,] as it were contrary to the Unity of Essence; in which I am not afraid to say he was mistaken.

146, 75,

5thly. Acts 7, 30, There appeared to him an Angel of the Lord in a flame of Fire in the Bush.] Here Dr Clarke hath proved, that it was the unanimous Opinion of the Ancients, that this Angel was Christ: To which he might have added, that almost all the same Fathers expressly say, that it could not be God the Father, and that it was impious so to think. To this effect the Doctor cites Justin Martyr, Apol. 2. To which add, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 282, 283, 284, & passim. The Doctor cites also the Synod

Synod
Tertu
tian,
Eccl
p. 20
& A
rum
cend
here s
with A
speakin
down
gain,
not the
cum
mana
iterun
vidi
descen
filius,
tio pr
who in
braham
ses, say
Affliction
down to
things, t
God, a&

Synod of Antioch: To which add, Tertullian adv. prax. c. 16. Novatian, c. 25, 26, 27. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. l. 1. c. 2. Irenaeus, l. 3. c. 6, p. 208, [‘Filius hic significat, qui & Abraham colloquutus sit; Et iterum loquente filio ad Moysen, descendi liberare populum meum’;] He here signifies the Son, who also talked with Abraham: And again; The Son speaking to Moses, saith, I am come down to deliver my People. And again, l. 4, c. 17, The Jews receive not the Word of God, [‘Nescientes eum qui in figura loquutus sit humana, ad Abraham, & Aaron, & iterum ad Moysen, dicentem, videris vidi tribulationem populi mei, & descendi liberare eos; hæc enim filius, qui est verbum Dei, ab initio præstruebat’;] not knowing him who in a Humane Form spake to Abraham and Aaron, and again to Moses, saying, surely I have seen the Affliction of my People, and am come down to deliver them: For in these things, the Son, who is the Word of God, acted previously from the Beginning.

ginning. When therefore he saith, chap. II of the same Book, [ipse igitur Christus, cum patre, est vivorum Deus, qui locutus est Moyfi, qui & patribus manifestatus est,] that Christ, with the Father, is the God of the Living, who spake to Moses, and was manifested to the Fathers; he must join the Father with him, because he spake, (say Justin Martyr, and Theophilus,) in the Person of the Father.

6 pag. 27,
28.

6thly. Rom. II, 36, For of him, and from him, and to him are all things; that is, saith this Interpreter, of him as he is the Father, from him as he is Son, and to (or in) him as he is the Holy Ghost: Which strained Sense is not countenanced by St Paul, but confuted by v. 32, 33, 34; and by the Doxology immediately following, which shows that he speaks of One and the same Person; and by those Words of Novatian, which this Author ignorantly cites in favour of his Opinion: For, speaking there of God the Father; Whom, saith he, the Apostle

postle ca
be sa
to him
perio e
for all
pire, as
digested
him, (C
Word;
dunt u
pectant
fita, in
' and
' Judgn
' rption
' back u
' pect
' God.

7thly.
Form of
be equal
that this
derstand
these W
Words
the Doc
ture-Doc

apostle calls the Only God, and of whom
 he saith, of him and from him and
 to him are all things ; [nam & im-Cap. 3.
 perio ejus omnia, ut ex ipso sunt,]
 for all things are subject to his Em-
 pire, as they are Of him ; and are
 digested by his Word, as they are By
 him, (who made all things by his
 Word ;) [& in judicium ejus reci-
 dunt universa, ut dum in ipso ex-
 pectant libertatem, corruptione depo-
 sita, in ipsum videantur esse revocata,]
 and all things fall again under his
 Judgment, so that, putting off Cor-
 ruption, they may seem to be called
 back unto Him, from whom they ex-
 pect the Liberty of the Sons of
 God.

7thly. Phil. 2, 6, Who being in the pag. 96. 7
 Form of God, thought it no Robbery to
 be equal with God.] Here it appears
 that this Learned Writer did not un-
 derstand Dr Clarke's Interpretation of
 these Words, nor well consider the
 Words of Novatian fully cited by
 the Doctor, page 179 of his Scrip-
 ture-Doctrine. For those Words of
 Novatian,

Novatian, not only show, that Christ, seeing he proceeded from God the Father, could not have just Reason to compare himself to the Father, because all that he was, he derived from the Father's Gift: Which, (if the same individual Essence of the Father was from Eternity wholly, and necessarily derived to him, so as to make him equal in Essence, Power, Dignity, and Glory with the Father,) could be no Argument, since equals may be compared to equals; nor could the same individual Essence be obedient to its self in all things, as (saith Novatian) the Son was obedient to the Father even before his Incarnation: The words of Novatian (I say) not only show This, but they signify moreover, that if Christ had done this, he had snatched that Divinity to himself which belonged not to him; For what else can these following words signify, [ex quo probatur nunquam arbitratum illum esse rapinam quandam divinitatem, ut æquaret se patri Deo,] from whence it appears, that he never thought fit so

C. 17.

to claim to himself Divinity, as to
equal himself with God his Father?
And to this Sense these Words are
either explained or perverted by Eu-
sebius, in this Enquiry,
how could he have esteem-
ed it rapine to be equal
with God, if he himself
had been GOD?

Πῶς δὲ ἐκ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ
ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἰσὺ Θεῷ,
αὐτὸς ὡς ὁ Θεός; Ec-
cles. Theol. l. 1. c. 20. p.
94.

8thly. Coloss. 1, 15, *Who is the I- pag. 104. 8*
mage of the Invisible God, the First-born
of every Creature.] The Citation here
from Origen hath been already confi-
dered; where it hath been fully shew-
ed from this Phrase, *the Image of*
God, that he clearly accounted the
Son inferiour to the Father. And
hence many of the *Ante-Nicene* Fa-
thers concludethem to be two Things;
according to those Words of Euse-
bius, *The Image*, and that
of which it is the Image,
is never One and the same
Thing, but they are two
Substances, two Things,
and two Powers. The lat-
ter Clause of This Text,

Οὐ δὴ πρὸς τὸ εἶναι
καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἡ αὐτὴν, ἐν
καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀπνοεῖται, ἀλλὰ
δύο μὲν οὐσίαι, καὶ δύο
περὶ γινώσκοντες, καὶ δύο δυνά-
μεις. Contr. Marcell. p.
25.

H

hath

hath moved too many of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers to stile our Lord *κτίσμα, ποίημα, factura, ποσώνησις, a Creature, though created before all other Beings. So Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 5, p. 591. Strom. 6, p. 644. Pseudo-Clemens, Recog. 1. 3. sect. 8. Gregory Thaumaturgus, apud Basil. epist. 64. p. 101. Theognostus, apud Photium, cod. 105. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 2. p. 9.*

✓

V. Lastly, I observe that to prove the Divinity of Christ in *His* Sense, he insists upon three Places, which none of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers ever cited to that purpose ; viz. *2 Pet. 1, 1. Jude 4. 1 Job. 5, 20.* The Reason why they did not cite the *last* place, seems to be this ; that they did not read as we do, but thus ; *the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸ ἀληθινὸν θεόν, that we may know the True God : So Oecumenius, and most Manuscripts : ὅτι ἔσμεν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἰησοῦ χειρῷ, so St Basil, l. 4. contr. Eunom. p. 775 ; ἔτι, &c. The Son*

Son
us an
know
true
Churc
our I
2 The
we an
God
is the
of hi
Job.
the
his M
he h
where
the A
they
the O
Dr Ca
his o
Citatio
vation
that th
tiore
terpol
by a la
himfel

Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that we might know the true God, and be in his true Son Jesus Christ, (as being the Church in God the Father, and in our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Thess. 1, 1. 2 Thess. 1, 1.) This (God, in whom we are, and of whom the Son of God hath given us the Knowledge,) is the true God; And the Knowledge of him (as our Lord hath told us, Job. 17, 3.) is eternal Life. Thus the Disciple accords perfectly with his Master, and only teacheth us what he had learned from him. And whereas this Author cites two of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, to prove that they called Christ the True God; the One, Melito Sardensis, cited by Dr Cave from Anastasius Sinaita in his ὁδηγός; The Authority of this Citation is enervated by this Observation of the same Learned Dr Cave, that this Work hath been [a recentiore quadam manu haud leviter interpolatum,] not a little interpolated by a later Hand; and that Anastasius himself confesseth, that it was a Work,

L. 4. c.
14.

[*nulla diligentia, nullo ordine conscriptum,*] *written without Order or Care.* His *second* Testimony is from *Irenæus*; who, disputing against the *Valentinians*, who denied both Christ's true Divinity and Humanity, says that he was by the Testimony of the Father and the Holy Spirit, [*vere Homo, & vere Deus,*] *truly Man, and truly God*; which the very *Arians* owned, and Dr *Clarke* doth much less deny: But then this Word and Son, in the same Chapter, is plainly distinguished from [*Unus Deus Pater,*] *the One God the Father.* He is *the Son, that ministers to the Father, to whom the Father hath subjected all Things, and who reveals the Father,* [*quibus & quando vult Pater,*] *to whom, when, and as, (not He, but) the Father wills*; and therefore cannot be [*Deus altissimus*] *the most High God*, of whom *Irenæus* speaks, *chap. 13.* And, this our Author might have learned more fully from the numerous and judicious Citations of Dr *Clarke*, from this and other Antient Fathers, (*p. 63, 250, 333, 334, &c.*)

of h
tain
Auth
from
shall
moni

I
vatio
in so
tradi
Ante-
plain
stand
right
Sabell
cult
it. F

(ist
' racte
' head
' Fath
' Fath
' that
' as th
as alr
thers
liation

of his *Scripture-Doctrine* ;) which contain a full Confutation of all this Author's Citations from the Fathers, from p. 46, to p. 51. And so much shall suffice for Answer to his *Testimonies*.

I shall *conclude* with this Observation: that this Learned Layman in some of his Assertions flatly contradicts the general Doctrine of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers; in others he plainly shows he doth not understand it; And that when he once rightly understands the Opinion of *Sabellius*, he will find it very difficult to clear his Sentiments from it. For instance,

(1st,) He asserts, p. 36, that 'the Character of Father depends on the God-head, and not upon the Will (of the Father;) and that he is as necessarily Father, as God; and consequently that the Son is as necessarily Son, as the Father is Father': Whereas almost all the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers say, that he had his Power, Filiation, and all that he had, from the

the *Will* of the Father ; as may fully appear from the Authors cited * in the Margin. Again, when he saith, (ibid.)

[* *Christus est Dei filius κατὰ θέλημα, καὶ δύναμιν Θεοῦ* ;] *Christ is the Son of God, by the Will and Power of God ; Ignatius ad Smyrn. §. 1. [Est Dominus virtutum κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς ;] He is the Lord of Hosts, by the Will of his Father ; Justin. Dial. p. 311. Ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προελθὼν ; Proceeding forth from the Father, by his Power and Will ; p. 327. Κατ' ἐνδοξίαν τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ ἀποφύτου ; According to the Good Pleasure of the Invisible Father ; Irenaeus, l. 1. c. 2. [Est causa omnium διὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ παντοκράτορος πατρὸς ;] He is the Cause of all, by the Will of the Almighty Father ; Clem. Al. Strom. 7. p. 704. [Εὐ καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς gubernat omnium salutem ;] And by the Will of his Father, he directs the Salvation of All ; Strom. 5. p. 598. [Tunc, cum Deus voluit, ipsum primum protulit sermonem ;] God produced the Word himself first, when he Willed to do so ; Tertull. adv. prax. c. 6. [Ex quo quando ipse voluit, sermo filius natus est ; Hic ergo, quando pater voluit, processit ex patre ;] The Word, which is the Son, was born of the Father, at the Will of the Father ; He was therefore produced by the Father, when the Father Willed it ; Novatian. c. 31. [Quando voluit Deus facere quae facienda deliberaverat, τὸν τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε θεωροεχόν ;] When God would create the Things he had determined to create, he begat or emitted This Word ; Theophilus, p. 100. Θελήματι δὲ τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτοῦ ἀπεπαδὼ ὁ λόγος ; The word proceeded from the Will of the Father's Singleness ; Tatian, p. 145. Βυληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς γένονεν υἱὸς πατρὸς ;*

(ibid.)
er
Po
no
Fa
Ante
the
Com
dual
them
cessar
free
the
ving
ther,
Empi
many

τῆς ἐκ
ἡν ; For
Son ; T
Will a
[Deniq
tis eoru
of our
tings ;

(*ibid.*) 'Christ received not his Power by Donation; and again, that his Power, founded upon his Nature, is no more by bare Donation from his Father, than his very Being': The *Ante-Nicene* Fathers derive Both from the Donation of the Father, not by Communication of the same individual Essence, (of which not One of them saith any thing,) nor by necessary Generation; and therefore by free Donation; he being Lord by the Power of the Father, and having received all Things from his Father, having his Kingdom, Honour and Empire, given him of the Father: with many Expressions of the like Nature:
As

τῆς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς βουλῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως ὑπομείνου
 ἡν; For God, by his Will, became the Father of the Son; The Son received his Essence from the Father's Will and Power; Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 4. c. 3:
 [Deniq; hoc ὁι σοφώτατοι τῶν Πατέρων in scriptis eorum propriis sanciverunt;] Lastly, the wisest of our Fathers declared the same thing in Their Writings; L. 1. Conty. Marcel. c. 4. p. 20.

† [Christus

As may be fully seen in the Citations
quoted in the † Margin.

2dly. When

† [Christus est Dominus, accepta a Patre omni
potestate;] *Christ is the Lord, having received all
Power from the Father; Herm. Simil. 5ta. [Est vir-
tus patris, cui pater ejus τὸ πᾶν ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν;
He is the Power of the Father, to whom the Father
hath given so great Authority; Just. Dial. p. 269.
Habet omnia quæ habet, ἡ γὰρ τὴν τῆς πατρὸς ἐξουσίαν
ἔχει; He hath all Things which
he hath, by the Power given to him of the Almighty;
ibid. 369. [Irenæus dicit, eum dominium accepisse a
patre omnis conditionis;] He received from his Fa-
ther Dominion over the Whole Creation; l. 3. c. 5.
[A patre accepisse potestatem ad judicandum Sodo-
mites, a patre accepisse æternum Regnum in Israel;]
He received from his Father, Power to judge the So-
domites; he received from his Father an everlasting
Kingdom over Israel; ibid. c. 12. p. 232. [Filius,
(inquit Clemens) dabit nobis æternam vitam παρὰ
ἐκείνου λαβὼν, a patre eam accipiens;] The Son
will give unto Us eternal Life, having received it
from his Father; Quis Dives c. 5. §. 7. [Omnia sibi
tradita dicit filius a patre;] The Son saith, All Things
are delivered unto him of the Father; Tertull. contra
Marcion, l. 4. c. 45. [Est omnipotens quæ sermo
Dei omnipotentis, quæq; omnium accepit potesta-
tem; Est Deus virtutum, quia omnia subiecta sunt
illi a patre;] He is All-powerful, as being the Word
of the All-powerful God, and having received Power
over all; He is the God of Hosts, because all Things
are made subiect to him by the Father; Adv. Prax.
cap. 17. [Habet rerum omnium potestatem, sed quæ
traditam,*

traditam
tre sibi
but as de
nicated t
631
ei regnu
fulness to
dom and
[Quia n
impleret
suam h
men acc
but only
he receiv
nour of a
the Title

ally. When he saith, p. 109, 110, 111, that 'the ~~Word~~ [the internal Word] was usually taken by the Christian Authors for the Thoughts of the Mind, as it stands for the Thoughts; and not for the Faculty; and that when they called the Son Thought, they must not be conceived to have spoken of him as a bare effect of the simple Faculty of Conceiving and Understanding, but as a divine Person, the adequate fruit of so

traditam, sed qua concessam, sed qua a proprio patre sibi indultam;] He hath Power over all things, but as delivered to him, as granted to him, as communicated to him from his own Father; Novatian. c. 21 & 31 [Ob fidem quam Deo exhibuit, datum est ei regnum, & honor, & imperium;] For his Faithfulness to God (Heb. 3, 2,) there is given him a Kingdom and Honour and Dominion; Lactan. l. 4. c. 12. [Quia nihil sibi assumpsit, ut mittentis mandatum impleret; & sacerdotis perpetui dignitatem, & Regis summi honorem, & Judicis potestatem, & Dei nomen accepit;] Because he assumed nothing to himself, but only fulfilled the Command of him that sent him; he received the Dignity of a perpetual Priest, the Honour of a King most High, the Power of a Judge, and the Title of God. cap. 14.

I

' com-

' compleat a Mind and intellectual
 ' Nature as the person of the Fa-
 ' ther': It is manifest that he nei-
 ther understood aright either Theo-
 philus, Tatian, or Tertullian; who
 all manifestly speak of this λόγος
 ἐνδεδειγμένος [the internal Word] as
 a Faculty or Attribute, existing in
 the Father before his Generation of
 the Son; and That by which he
 himself was λογικός, & σοφός, Rati-
 onal and Wise. God, saith Athenag-
 oras, from the Beginning, being an
 eternal Mind, ἔχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ λό-
 γον. αἰδίως λογικός ὢν, had the Word
 in himself, being from Eternity Rati-
 onal, and That Word did afterwards
 ἐπελθεῖν, come forth to Operation;
 according to those Words of Solomon
 Prov. 8, concerning Wisdom, God created me
 the beginning of his ways for his
 Works: Whence it is evident, that
 the Logos in God was his Reason,
 and his Wisdom. Theophilus saith,
 that God had always in his Heart
 this λόγος ἐνδεδειγμένος, [this internal
 Word,] as his Counsellor, before he
 produced any thing; νῦν δὲ φερίησιν ὁρᾶται,
 be

pag. 10.

Prov. 8,
 22, accor-
 ding to
 the LXX.

L. 2. p.
 110.

be
 when
 the
 gener
 so a
 veste
 Whe
 fore
 only
 Fath
 faith
 was
 with
 μεως
 by his
 which
 ter f
 but n
 void
 tullian
 pose:
 Opini
 Father
 he say
 lus, ac
 all Th
 ration
 cause

he being his Mind and Wisdom : But
when he would produce all things,
 τῶν τ' λόγον ἐγέννησε ὑποφανεῖν, *he*
generated this Word externally, yet not
so as thereby to be λόγῳ κενωθείς, di-
vested of his own internal Reason :
 Where again it is evident, that be-
 fore his Generation, this Word was
 only the *Mind and Wisdom* in the
 Father. Tatian yet more plainly pag. 1.
 faith, that from the Beginning God
 was alone, yet not so alone, but that
 with him subsisted, Ἀφ' ὧν λόγῳ δυνά-
 μεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ λόγος ὅς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ,
 by his Rational Power, even That Word
 which was in him, and came out af-
 ter from the Power of the Father,
 but not so as to leave the Father
 void of Reason. But above all, Ter-
 tullian is plain and full to this pur-
 pose : For, as he elsewhere tells his Contr.
 Opinion, that God was not always a Hermon.
 Father; so in his Book against Praxeas, c. 3.
 Adv. prax. he says, [ante omnia Deus erat so- c. 5, 6, 7.
 lus, adusq; filii generationem,] before
 all Things were made, 'till the Gene-
 ration of the Son, God was Alone, be-
 cause nothing existed [extrinsecus] ex-
 ternal

ternal to him; yet was he not so Alone, but that he had with him, [quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet,] That Reason which he had in himself; [Rationalis etenim Deus, & ratio in ipso prius,] for God was Rational, and Reason was in him before the Generation of the Son. This Reason, he afterwards calls Wisdom; and compares it with the Faculty in Man; styling it, [secunda persona condita,] the second Person framed; from those Words of Solomon, [Deus condidit me initium viarum ad opera,] God created me the Beginning of his Ways, for his Works: And adds, that when God said let there be Light, then He received [hanc Speciem] this Form, and was [generatus ad effectum] actually generated, and made the Son of God; [de quo prodeundo generatus est,] by coming forth from whom, he was generated. Hence Eusebius, who well understood the Sentiments of the Antients, saith, that in this Sense, neither Jew, Gentile, nor Sabellian will deny The Word; for none of them dares deny *θεὸν ἑὸν ὁμοῦν*, that God

Prov. 8,
22, according to the
LXX.

Ecel.
Theol. l.
i. c. 16.
p. 78.

is Wise, or λογικὸν endued with Reason.

Lastly. Whereas he is unwilling to come under the blame of Sabellianism, I will from the Fathers lay down the Sabellians true Sentiments. St Basil declares, they held ^{Epist. 349.} only *μία ὑπόστασις*, One Subsistence ^{P. 345.} in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that God did *πάλαιος ὡς ἑκείνου φωνῶν*, speak sometimes as the Father, viz. when he spake to the Son or Holy Spirit, or sent the Son into the World; and sometimes in the Person of the Son, as when he descended to take care of us, or *οὕτως ἄλλας ἑνὰς οὐνονομαχίας ἐργείας*, to some other dispensatory Operations; and sometimes in the Person of the Holy Ghost, when he speaks agreeably to That Person. And Epiphanius informs us, that they [the Sabellians] illustrated their Doctrine from the similitude of the Sun, which being *μία ὑπόστασις*, one in Substance, had *ἐν ἐργείαις τρεῖς*, three several Operations, that of heating, illuminating, and turning

turning itself round. As to the first, they compared it to the Holy Spirit; as to the second, to the Son; and as to the third, to the Father. And that the Son being sent forth as a Ray, did all things in the World belonging to the Evangelical Dispensation, and the Salvation of Mankind: And that the Holy Spirit, being sent into the World, did enter into all that were worthy of him; and did revive, cherish, and warm them by his Power and Presence. Whence it is evident, that Sabellius allowed distinct Operations to the Son, and Holy Ghost; and, as Theodoret saith, *τοὺς ἐκδρομίας, sections and Effluxes* from the Father. And now let this Learned Gentleman show, what greater Distinction can be made betwixt three Persons, individually One in Essence, and in all external Operations. The Learned

Haz. Fab.
l. 2. c. 9.

* Addo ego, personam, sine essentia concipi non posse, nisi statueris personam in divinis nihil aliud esse quam merum *τὸν ὑπόστατον*, quod

ed * Bishop Bull declares, that it is plain Sabellianism to affirm a Person [in divinis] to be no more than a Mode of Existence.

Existence. And what it can (according to this Gentleman's Notion) signify in the Son more than his manner of Existence by Generation from the Father ; or in the Holy Ghost, than his manner of Existence by Procession from the Father and the Son ; it will not, I think, be very easy intelligibly to declare.

plane Sabellianum est. l.

4 p. 439.

That is : I add, that a Person cannot be conceived without Essence, unless you make a Person in Divine Matters to be nothing else but a mere Mode of Existence ; Which is plainly Sabellian.

I do not think his *third* Chapter worthy of any Consideration, either for the Arguments, or the Authorities contained in it ; it being too evident, to those who are well versed in the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, that here the whole stream of Authority runs strong against him.

I know something hath been alleged against some Particulars produced in these Papers, by the Reverend *Bishop Bull* and *Doctor Grabe* : But what they allege,

